

R E M A R K S

The numbering of claims stands objected to as not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. As shown in the set of claims attached hereto, the misnumbered claims 40-103 have been renumbered as claims 31-94. For consistency, the claims amended herein show the amendments which renumbered the claims.

Claims 1-94 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 12-25, 27-29, 31, 33-41, 43-45, 47, 49-60, 62-64, 66, 68-72, 74-76, 78, 81-85, 87-89, 91 and 94, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Plantz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,088,702 ("Plantz").

The Examiner has held, with regard to claim 1, that Plantz teaches a method for preparing a presentation, comprising:

connecting a plurality of geographically dispersed contributors to a controller through a network to collaborate to prepare the presentation;

allowing the contributors to propose contributions to the presentation, the proposed contributions residing on storage devices under the control of the contributors;

making the proposed contributions available for viewing and comment by the contributors;

allowing the controller to select one or more of the proposed contributions and

providing the controller access through the network to the storage devices to retrieve the selected contributions for inclusion into the presentation.

Plantz teaches a Group Publishing System (GPS) in which authors and editors contribute to a group authored project which makes the partially assembled product available to all users. As noted in Plantz col. 7, lines 34 - 37:

"Once an editing session is in progress, the system allows no other user to access the editing module for that document, or edited document segment, until the first user's editing session has ended."

Plantz therefore teaches that the system will not allow authors to concurrently collaborate to edit or prepare the presentation. Applicant therefore respectfully traverses the Examiner's holding that Plantz teaches or suggests:

"connecting a plurality of geographically dispersed contributors to a controller through a network to concurrently collaborate to prepare the presentation"

as claimed in claim 1 as presently amended.

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, the Examiner has held that it is inherent that a path to the segment of the document that the editor has selected to download is used when the editor downloads the document.

However, as noted in col. 7, lines 28-31, Plantz teaches:

"A user of the GPS of this invention begins an editing session by accessing the gateway or top-level of the GPS URL, through which the user is permitted access to the document to be edited or authored."

Applicant therefore respectfully traverses the Examiner's holding that it is inherent in Plantz that the script includes the path for retrieving the segment for editing because Plantz teaches that the authors connect via URL to the project through which the user may edit the document. This suggests that the document to be edited, although it may have originated at the user, is maintained for editing at the project location. Applicant therefore respectfully traverses the Examiner's holding that Plantz teaches or suggests, as claimed in claim 8:

"the script includes a path for retrieving a selected contribution through the network from a storage device."

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 2, the Examiner has held that it is inherent that in Plantz, it is inherent that a path to the segment of the document that the editor has selected to download is used when the editor downloads the document. As noted above with regard to col. 7, lines 28-31, Plantz teaches that the author access the document for editing via a URL, rather than download it as suggested by the Examiner. Nothing in Plantz suggests, as claimed in claim 10:

"providing a path for retrieving a contribution through the network from a storage device."

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, the Examiner has held that Plantz teaches that the presentation is prepared on the controller terminal (see column 7, lines 37 - 43). The cited text however, teaches that:

"The GPS provides a control window, or interface, which allows the user to edit the document according to a style specified by the overall administrator of the GPS assembled project, to edit only a part of the document,

or to select additional modules which facilitate uploading of other data, such as pictures, video, or audio."

As noted above with regard to 1, the Examiner has interpreted the editor in Plantz to be the equivalent of a controller in the present invention. The use of the control window as cited above teaches on the use of a convenient interface, not an operation of the controller. Applicant therefore respectfully traverses the Examiner's holding that Plantz teaches or suggests, as claimed in claim 16:

"the presentation is prepared on the controller terminal."

With respect to independent claim 20, as noted above with respect to claim 1, nothing in Plantz suggests:

"connecting a plurality of geographically dispersed contributors to a controller through a network to concurrently collaborate to prepare the presentation";

With respect to independent claim 38, as noted above with respect to claim 1, nothing in Plantz suggests:

"a controller terminal for connecting through a network to a plurality of geographically dispersed contributor terminals to allow contributors to concurrently collaborate to prepare the presentation, the terminal operable to allow the contributors to propose contributions to the presentation that reside on storage devices under the control of the contributors, the terminal further operable to make the proposed contributions available through the network for viewing and comment by contributors, to allow a controller to select one or more of the proposed contributions for

inclusion into the presentation, and to provide the controller access through the network to the storage devices to retrieve the selected contributions for inclusion into the presentation".

With respect to independent claim 55, as noted above with respect to claim 1, nothing in Plantz suggests:

"a controller terminal for connecting through a network to a plurality of geographically dispersed contributor terminals to allow contributors to concurrently collaborate to prepare the presentation, the terminal operable to allow the contributors to propose contributions to the presentation that reside on storage devices under the control of the contributors, the terminal further operable to make the proposed contributions available through the network for viewing and comment by contributors, to allow a controller to select one or more of the proposed contributions for inclusion into the presentation, to provide the controller access through the network to the storage devices to retrieve the selected contributions for inclusion into the presentation, and to display the presentation".

With respect to independent claim 71, as noted above with respect to claim 1, nothing in Plantz suggests:

"connecting a plurality of geographically dispersed contributors to a controller through a network to concurrently make contributions to the presentation, the contributions residing on storage devices under the control of the contributors".

With respect to independent claim 84, as noted above with respect to claim 1, nothing in Plantz suggests:

"a controller terminal for connecting through a network to a plurality of geographically dispersed contributor terminals to allow contributors to concurrently make contributions to the presentation that reside on storage devices under the control of the contributors, the terminal further operable to provide the controller access through the network to the storage devices to retrieve one or more contributions for inclusion into the presentation immediately prior to display and to display the retrieved contributions as part of the presentation".

Applicant therefore respectfully traverses the Examiner's holding of obviousness over Plantz of independent claims 1, 20, 38, 55, 71 and 84, as well claims 2-4, 6-8, 10, 12-19, 21-25, 27-29, 31, 33-37, 39-41, 43-45, 47, 49-54, 56-60, 62-64, 66, 68-70, 72, 74-76, 78, 81-83, 85, 87-89, 91 and 94 which are dependent thereon.

Claims 5, 9, 11, 26, 30, 32, 42, 46, 48, 61, 65, 67, 73, 77, 79, 80, 86, 90, 92 and 93 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plantz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,088,702 in view of Arcuri et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,121,968 ("Arcuri").

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's holding of obviousness over Plantz in view of Acuri of claims 5, 9, 11, 26, 30, 32, 42, 46, 48, 61, 65, 67, 73, 77, 79, 80, 86, 90, 92 and 93 which are dependent on independent claims 1, 20, 38, 55, 71 and 84 for the reasons noted above with respect to Plantz.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider his rejections of claims 1-94, in light of the amendments made to all independent claims 1, 20, 38, 55, 71 and 84 for the reasons

Serial No.: 09/881,133

noted above, and pass this case to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Norman E. Brunell".

Norman E. Brunell, Reg. No. 26,533

IRELL & MANELLA LLP
1800 Avenue of the Stars
Suite 900
Los Angeles, CA 90067-4276
(310) 277-1010
(310) 203-7199 Facsimile
nbrunell@irell.com